

## **INTRODUCTION TO AIDS INC.**

by Jon Rappoport

This is just a brief note about why I included *AIDS INC.* in Volume 1 of *The Matrix Revealed*.

The book is about much more than AIDS; that is, its implications lead you right into the heart of major strategies of the medical cartel:

The invention of specific diseases, based on fraudulent research and absurd (but hypnotic) definitions and labels.

The adoption of useless and misleading tests to diagnose the diseases.

Through direct accusation and phony diagnoses, the false inclusion of millions of people under the umbrella of the disease label.

The conniving to push aside dissident views and critics.

The treatment of these “diseases” with toxic drugs whose effects actually produce the very conditions attributed to the disease.

The building of a smokescreen to obscure what is really making people sick in their lives.

It is one thing to point out these factors—it is quite another thing to actually dive into a specific instance where all these factors come into play. I dove in with *AIDS INC.*

I had no idea what I was in for.

I ended up recording miles of false facts and devious strategy. I learned how the operation is carried off.

At the very top, the medical cartel is about creating fictions that drive the global population into toxic debilitation and slavish ties to a system whereby billions of people, willingly, enter into a cradle-to-grave relationship with diagnosis and treatment, and wear their diagnoses and status as a patient as a proud badge of honor.

Eventually, the healthy and strong individual becomes THE OUTSIDER, in an endless culture of toxicity.

Jon Rappoport

San Diego

2011

## **NOTES IN THE WAY OF INTRODUCTION**

As I cut my teeth on this research, I realized that a disease could be invented. The suffering that goes with illness is very real, but the labeling of that suffering is one of the great and perverse powers of the medical cartel.

Because if you can name **VARIOUS AND DIVERSE** suffering that comes from many different causes and put it under one umbrella, one title, you can later claim you have found the one cause of the one disease, a cause that is a germ. And then you can find a drug which you say will kill the germ.

That is the pattern.

That is the deception when it comes to AIDS and a number of other so-called diseases. In the case of AIDS, I showed that HIV was never proved to cause anything. I also showed that AIDS was not one thing. AIDS was in truth a variety of states of immune suppression brought about, in different groups and, ultimately, different individuals by a large number of **DIFFERENT** causes.

And therefore, although people were suffering and dying, they were not dying of AIDS, because there is no AIDS. AIDS is a word that is used as a label, a useless label.

The label diverts attention from the fact that many, many people can be cured of immune suppression not by drugs, not by AZT, but by rebuilding their health and removing the cause or causes of their problems, whenever possible. What causes? Could be pesticide poisoning, or other medical drugs, or street drugs, or intestinal parasites, or starvation, or protein-calorie malnutrition, or contaminated water supplies, or vaccine injury, or any of a hundred other things. You have to examine the person and find out.

In this research you are about to read, which took place between 1986 and 1988, I also realized that AIDS was a perfect cover story for a covert targeting of populations, from gay men in NYC to Africans in Uganda. Because, if you labeled them with AIDS, already a kind of hypnotic death sentence, and then you treated them with highly toxic drugs like AZT, and you also, in effect, concealed what was really making them sick, you had **DEPOPULATION ON THE MARCH**.

Let me give you another example of an invented disease: hepatitis. That's right. In truth, you have people suffering from liver toxicity. That is what hepatitis really is. The germs said to cause hepatitis are really only minor adjuncts, at best. There are hundreds of reasons a person may have an overburdened and toxic liver. Drugs of all kinds, including medical drugs, contaminated water supplies, inhalation of uranium dust, and so on. In fact, we are now hearing about uranium-induced hepatitis---a contradiction in terms if there ever was one. If uranium is causing the liver to fail, then **THAT IS WHAT IS WRONG**, and the word hepatitis does not

apply at all. If someone hits you over the head with a big hammer and you become disabled for the rest of your life, is that Alzheimer's? Of course not.

*AIDS INC.* was meant to convey and elaborate on several essential points.

One, HIV was never proved to cause anything, and there was no reason to suspect that it was causing anything.

Two, the word AIDS was actually a term that was being applied to a wide variety of cases of immune suppression, and that suppression was being caused by hundreds of different factors in different people.

Three---I went on to describe some of those different non-viral causative factors.

Four, the test for a virus that caused nothing was a very deceptive test. Not only was it looking for an irrelevant virus, it could read falsely positive for that irrelevant virus, thus initiating a cascade of medical interventions that were toxic and useless and often lethal.

*AIDS INC.* serves as an UN-BRAINWASHING tool. Using it, one can discern all sorts of intelligence/medical OPS that have been foisted on the global population.

Someone who teaches a course in the history of science should use it as a textbook. Of course, if he did, he would be fired, and his students might rebel in large numbers as well. Students want to believe a number of lies, which this book works on like a cross-cut saw.

I once knew a doctor who read *AIDS INC.* He was furious. I think he wanted to throttle me. I introduced him to a man who had been diagnosed with full-blown AIDS, had suffered liver damage from AZT, and was getting ready to die. Then the ill man did a strange thing. He rejected HIV as the cause of his problems. He went off all drugs. He changed his diet. He slowly began to exercise. He decided there was some kind of spiritual dimension to his life. He told his drug-using friends to go away and never come back. He regained his health in a year. He began running road races.

When the doctor met him, the doctor ran screaming into the night.

Over the years I have met people who said my book saved their lives. They had read it and decided they were victims of mind control, and they had then changed their minds and rejected the death sentence they had been handed, and they rejected HIV as anything they needed to worry or think about.

I also encountered a few death and dying groups that were preparing those who had been diagnosed with HIV for the afterlife. They wanted nothing to do with me. I was an intruder on the dying fest. I was offering something they hadn't thought about. They were against any real

form of struggle. They wanted to give people a quiet room and emotional support on the way to wherever. I'm sure they gave succor to some people.

But I also pointed out to their leaders that there was a way to live. Others had tried it and succeeded. They smiled and said no thank you. From them I learned that the world could be a very strange place.

## **MORE NOTES IN THE WAY OF INTRODUCTION**

Every major OP has holes that can be probed from a number of angles.

When I examined AIDS in depth, I looked at the science. I felt there would be massive clues there, and I was right. Science is an easy door to open, because there are so many lies. Once you find one lie, you keep on going and you find more, and eventually you get to the heart of the matter. In the case of AIDS, the central lie is: AIDS is one thing, one disease caused by one germ. All of that is false, a ruse floated to disguise the OP. Learning about the OP called AIDS helps you understand OPS in general. You learn how complex they can be, how complex the lies can be. The complexity is put there to fool you, to enmesh you in the bulk of "information." As Hitler said, people will be more prone to believe a huge lie than a small one.

But there is more. If you can pile up the lies, layer on layer, you create an overall disguise which keeps the public at bay. That is how false science works. So you look for one tag-end, and you pull on it, and pretty soon you find where that leads, and you walk a circuitous path, but you do arrive at the truth. With AIDS, there never was any convincing evidence that HIV caused "the disease."

Once you realize that, you're in good shape. If you don't realize it, you're lost.

A MAJOR AIDS researcher (whose name I won't reveal because it might compromise my source) once said, "Even if HIV doesn't cause AIDS, it's a fascinating virus." Which tells you a whole lot about the mind set of some researchers. It's all an abstract problem to them.

Dr. Peter Duesberg, who was once considered a research star until he wrote a paper saying that HIV didn't cause AIDS, told me that during his work on the viral cancer project, he was very interested in these retroviruses (of which class HIV is a member), but then he realized there was no reason to suppose that any of the viruses actually caused cancer-so he quit the project. But most of the other stars didn't quit. They pressed on, and they became "the great viral researchers on the planet." They pressed on because, in essence, they didn't care that nothing good was coming out of their work. Harold Varmus, Robert Gallo, Max Essex, Luc Montagnier, et al. -- they have continued to sustain their reputations on the basis of their work with retroviruses. Work that really went nowhere. Duesberg has been attacked from every quarter -- even by people who agree that HIV does not cause AIDS. But he is the central hero of the story. He was the man who dared to sacrifice his own reputation in the rarified world of grants and published papers and academe. He stood up and he spoke about what he saw. He became the most important source on AIDS for many dissident reporters. He attacked the OP and the cover story at the level of science, and he won.

If truth is the real measure of winning.

Another hero is Dr. Harvey Bialy, who was the research editor at *Bio/Technology*, a journal owned by Nature, a more famous journal. Bialy saw the wisdom in what Duesberg was saying, and Bialy stood his ground, too, against the attacks of his own publisher. Bialy showed me that some published HIV research was actually based on nothing more than incorrect arithmetic.

He was prophetic, because later research on so-called "viral load" (a way of measuring the amount of HIV present in the body) would also come apart at the seams when you looked at the way certain numbers had been insidiously woven together.

Bialy and Duesberg are both key figures in the real story of AIDS. They have watched incompetent and greedy researchers publish more and more lies about HIV through the years. I happen to like heroes, and I like mentioning their names, because I want to show that heroes still exist.

Kary Mullis, the winner of the Nobel Prize in chemistry for his invention of the PCR process that amplifies gene-fragments, has come to Duesberg's defense. Mullis insists that there is not one paper in the literature that proves HIV causes AIDS. He derides those researchers who unthinkingly accept the HIV hypothesis.

Another Nobel winner, Wally Gilbert, who teaches at Harvard, has spoken in more muted tones about problems with the HIV hypothesis, as has Harry Rubin, a godfather of modern viral research, who teaches at UC Berkeley along with Duesberg.

Richard Strohman, a cell biologist at Berkeley, has voiced objections to the HIV model as well. There are many obvious objections, on scientific grounds, to HIV as the cause of AIDS. The traditional method of assigning a germ as the cause of a disease, called Koch's Postulates, has failed to make anything of HIV.

Many people diagnosed with AIDS do not show HIV present in their bodies. No one can find a convincing description, after 17 years, of how HIV destroys immune cells. And so on. Yet the press continues to parrot the party line, and governments all over the world support HIV as the cause of AIDS with billions of dollars.

In the years 1986-7, one of my first insights came from published material that indicated AIDS had literally dozens of possible symptoms. I reasoned that, with such a large list, we could be talking about multiple causes, and perhaps, by examining the so-called high risk groups I could find non-viral causes for some of these symptoms.

I did. Then it hit me like a thunderbolt.

AIDS was being stitched together out of a panoply of symptoms and a variety of causative factors. Except that the causes were being shunted into the background, in favor of HIV. I could see the invention of a disease-entity that spanned the globe. It was only a matter of time before reports would emerge tying together symptoms from every country in the world to HIV.

At the time, I naively thought that many people would be able to see the scam. I thought that by playing my trump card, eyes everywhere would open. The trump card was: AIDS IS NOT ONE THING. But I found that this type of brainwashing is very strong. People don't want to deconstruct a fabrication that is based on One. On One God, One Devil, One Germ, One Value. It's much easier to accept the "umbrella explanation." It's much easier to say and think about one thing than to break up the false entity into its myriad component parts and pore over them.

Many, many years later I would see this in action again, as reports of AL QAEDA began to circle the globe. People refused to consider the possibility that a bunch of separate things were falsely being welded into One. (Recent press accounts blithely indicate that there is a CHINESE Al Qaeda group.)

I offer this to you as a prime factor in propaganda and mind control: make the many into One.

I have reminded myself of this principle as I've probed to find the main elite that runs this planet. Don't be too anxious to find the one man, the one small group, the one "secret council." Be ready to accept that several elites are at work, and that they compete as well as cooperate. I've discovered that elites understand the wisdom and the uses of this competition: You can blame someone else, you can try to use the "other faction" as a cutout and thereby conceal your own identity, you can improve your own position by making deceptive agreements with your opponent.

There are several researchers who state that questioning the HIV virus as the cause of AIDS amounts to advocating promiscuity, free-for-all sex, and death for millions. This is absurd. The fact is, traditional sexually transmitted diseases, and the massive antibiotic dosing that goes with repeated incidents of these diseases, is very immunosuppressive. So one doesn't have to swear allegiance to current AIDS research to favor safer sex.

## **INTERVIEW WITH PETER DUESBERG**

This interview – with world-famous biologist Peter Duesberg of UC Berkeley – first published to my private newsletter subscribers in the spring of 2001 – was done over the course of several years (1988-94). It stands as a piece of the record of the "AIDS wars," in which the forces of "science" have tried to defend their lunatic position on AIDS against more and more dissident reporters and scientists.

Duesberg is the US scientist who blew the whistle on the false HIV hypothesis in 1987. As a result, Duesberg has been hammered by the med establishment, and his former status as the father of modern retrovirology and well-known recipient of grants to do cancer research, has been crushed by the med cartel.

JR: WHY DID YOU PUBLISH YOUR ORIGINAL PAPER IN CANCER RESEARCH, ON MARCH 1, 1987, WHICH SEVERELY CRITICIZED THE IDEA THAT HIV CAUSES AIDS?

PD: It is a simple answer. I saw many mistakes in the HIV theory.

JR: YOU HAD TO KNOW IT WAS GOING TO BRING DOWN A STORM ON YOUR HEAD.

PD: You don't think about that so much. You just do your work. I wanted to have a debate. That's what science is about. Somebody, like Robert Gallo, says that HIV causes AIDS, and then others respond.

JR: BUT YOU HAD TO KNOW...

PD: Perhaps I was a little naive...

JR: BUT IN HINDSIGHT?

PD: I wouldn't have changed anything. If you conceal what you think is the truth, you lose self-respect.

JR: OTHER SCIENTISTS DON'T SEEM TO THINK THAT WAY.

PD: I can't speak for them. They make their own choices. They do their own bad science.  
(laughs)

JR: WHAT IS THE BIGGEST REASON HIV IS A BAD CANDIDATE AS THE CAUSE OF AIDS?

PD: The virus doesn't do anything. No one has shown how it attacks cells in any significant way. If you contend you hammered a million nails with a hammer but the hammer is still brand



new with no scratches...you have to revisit that. You have to say you were just guessing. There is no proof.

JR: YOUR OPPONENTS CLAIM HIV DOES DO GREAT DAMAGE.

PD: Of course. They have to. That's their pet theory. If they had to retract it, the whole model of AIDS would collapse. The whole reason for giving these toxic drugs like AZT would also disappear.

JR: AZT IS A FAILED CHEMOTHERAPY DRUG.

PD: Yes. They put it on the shelf at the National Cancer Institute many years ago because it was useless. And then they dragged it out and gave it to people who had been diagnosed with AIDS. That is a crime. AZT is perhaps the most toxic drug ever released for long-term human use. It attacks all cells of the body. It prevents replication of DNA. It has a bit of a preference for the bone marrow, where certain cells of the immune system are manufactured.

JR: HOW CAN THEY DO THAT?

PD: The fact is, they did it. They wanted to bring out a drug they could say would destroy HIV.

JR: BUT HIV DOES NOTHING TO BEGIN WITH.

PD: They tried to say, at first, that HIV was attacking T-cells. But they couldn't show that. HIV infects perhaps one in a thousand or ten thousand T-cells. The body remakes so many T-cells every day, that rate of "infection" is nothing. It is meaningless. So when I pointed this out, they shifted their ground. They said HIV attacks the macrophages [other immune system cells]. That was another shot in the dark. They had no evidence for that either. Ever since then, they have been making all sorts of wild statements about how HIV is destroying the immune system. There is a new theory every other Wednesday: HIV is a trigger for a cascade of debilitating reactions; it hits the thymus directly. They go everywhere with these speculations. The fact that they change their tune so often...you see, that shows they simply don't know. They try to stay with the T-cell theory while they come up with these other ideas, so they don't look like they are at loose ends.

JR: BUT THEY ARE.

PD: Very loose. (laughs)

JR: YOU'VE HAD GRANT MONIES FIZZLE OUT.

PD: At Berkeley, where I teach, I have had my staff taken away. My lab was basically shut down. Graduate students were afraid to work with me. They thought it would keep them from getting good jobs later on.

JR: THAT HAD TO BE QUITE DISCOURAGING.

PD: Well sure. What is one to think when these things happen? The debate is being stifled. Everyone is taught that science means you try to argue, argue based on facts. That's how it's done. That's how you ensure that people don't get away with faulty experiments or faulty reasoning.

JR: YOU'VE SAID THAT THE WHOLE THEORY OF HIV CAUSATION IS FAULTY REASONING.

PD: And I guess I'll have to keep saying it. Look, when you start with an unproven virus as the cause of AIDS...all sorts of crazy things happen. The HIV blood test measures the presence of antibodies to the virus. On the basis of having antibodies, people are told they will probably or certainly die later on. But antibodies are traditionally a sign that the body has won the fight against the germ.

JR: WON THE FIGHT.

PD: Yes. If they ever market a vaccine against HIV, the test of its success will be that it produces antibodies to HIV. So then they would say the vaccine is a success. But if the blood test shows you have those same antibodies, that's a sign you will get AIDS. It makes no sense at all, but that doesn't stop them.

JR: DURING THE WAR ON CANCER, YOU WORKED WITH SOME OF THE LEADING RESEARCHERS WHO LATER BECAME THE BIG SHOTS IN AIDS RESEARCH. VARMUS, BALTIMORE, GALLO, MONTAGNIER.

PD: I know these people well. We were trying to show that cancer could be caused by retroviruses--the same class of germ as HIV. But after awhile, I realized this path, though interesting, wasn't really going anywhere.

JR: SO YOU STOPPED.

PD: Why pursue it?

JR: YET THESE MEN KEPT ON GOING.

PD: Again, that was their choice. They were committed. They felt they needed to continue.

JR: YOU THINK PART OF THEIR COMMITMENT WAS PERSONAL, NOT SCIENTIFIC.

PD: It was a new and exciting track. They were trying to put a square peg into a round hole.

JR: EGO.

PD: They saw an opportunity.

JR: AND LATER ON THEY SAW AN OPPORTUNITY WITH AIDS.

PD: They were languishing. Nothing was really happening. AIDS was a new chance for them to pull out of the closet those retroviruses again...that was what they knew, and they pushed it. They could see honor and prizes and prestige ahead.

JR: I THINK THAT YOU TAKE PLEASURE IN A GREATER SENSE OF REALISM.

PD: I don't mind admitting that these retroviruses are interesting but not very productive in disease research. I don't mind that.

JR: PEOPLE LIKE GALLO DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT ATTITUDE OF YOURS.

PD: Apparently not. Bob Gallo is a very driven man.

JR: DRIVEN TO FIND THE WRONG ANSWER.

PD: That's where he ended up. He is aware of the problems with his theory. But he pushes ahead. It's like riding a juggernaut. After awhile you can't get off and you won't get off. The whole thing just keeps moving, and you're on it for better or worse. And your colleagues recognize that. Everybody knows it, but no one talks about it.

JR: A RESEARCHER ONCE TOLD ME THAT A COLLEAGUE OF HIS, A LEADING LIGHT IN AIDS, SAID, "EVEN IF HIV DOESN'T CAUSE AIDS IT'S A FASCINATING VIRUS."

PD: That's quite a little story. That's the juggernaut. You have a researcher on board who really sees through a lot of the bad science, and yet he keeps riding...because if he managed to exit, he would be banned from the fraternity.

JR: THAT'S WHAT HAPPENED TO YOU.

PD: I got off the train very early. I was never really on it.

JR: DO YOU THINK YOU CAN WIN THIS FIGHT?

PD: That's a hard question to answer. The future is a long time. There are many more people around now who doubt the HIV hypothesis.

JR: BUT AS FAR AS THE AIDS RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT FOLDING UP ITS TENT...

PD: It won't happen that way. It will happen because other people take the tent apart.

JR: AND YOU CAN SEE THAT HAPPENING?

PD: It's possible. We're in an era where there is an epidemic of bad science. I don't like to say that, in a way, but it's absolutely true. Researchers are now playing a money and grant game. They own shares in companies that are trying to succeed based on scientific theories that are not sound. The researchers are making obvious mistakes in their papers. They're slanting data to support their investments. They're, for example, proposing that they have genetic solutions to all sorts of diseases--when the facts are not established. There is a whole raft of so-called autoimmune diseases, where the body is said to be attacking itself. It makes an interesting picture, but the facts are just not there. No one knows that these conditions are really autoimmune. They just make unsupported claims. It's like a new religion, the religion of autoimmunity. People want to accept these ideas and they don't want to do the science that proves or disproves them.

JR: WHAT ABOUT THE STUDIES THAT SAY 1000 PEOPLE WHO ARE HIV POSITIVE GO ON TO GET AIDS, AND THEREFORE AIDS IS CAUSED BY HIV?

PD: That is correlation, not causation. If you can't show that the virus actually destroys many, many cells, you don't have proof. And those HIV positive people may have other things wrong with them that cause them to get sick. And those people take AZT, which really does wreck the immune system, so some of them are dying from a drug.

JR: YOU WERE THOUGHT OF AS THE FATHER OF MODERN RETROVIROLOGY. HOW DOES SUCH A REPUTATION VANISH IN A FEW YEARS?

PD: There is a lot at stake here with AIDS. People are dying. Which is the most important thing. And there are reputations and money and prestige. When I came along and said the HIV theory was wrong...a lot of people were put on the edge of exposure. They will do a lot to prevent that.

JR: COULD HIV BE CAUSING A TOXIC REACTION IN THE BODY?

PD: The moon could be chasing a group of Martians in a space ship. But show some evidence for it. Show me something. They haven't done that.

JR: ONCE THE THEORY IS THERE--

PD: --Once people say that HIV causes AIDS, they can go on to say, "We just have to figure out how HIV does it. It might be A or B or C. We'll figure out which one." But you have to go back to the original issue, which is the assertion that HIV causes AIDS in the first place. That was never established. When Robert Gallo, in 1984, announced that he had found the cause of AIDS, there was not a single proof that had been advanced for that. So all these wonderful speculations about how HIV does it...that's just icing on a cake that has never been baked in the first place.

JR: I UNDERSTAND THAT BIOLOGISTS COME UP TO YOU AND TELL YOU PRIVATELY THAT YOU'RE RIGHT.

PD: That's happened to me. They say, "Thanks for doing the job," but they don't want to go out on a limb in public. Although that's changing. We're getting more scientists who will stand out there and say what they really think. Kary Mullis, Nobel laureate, who invented the PCR test, is being very public. He says outright that HIV is a piece of non-science.

JR: YOU'RE A VERY MAINSTREAM SCIENTIST.

PD: Well, that's the whole point. I was never trying to say that an injection of grass juice could cure all cancer. I was just assessing evidence in a very straightforward way. I have never thought of myself as coming from a strange position. You see, that's the whole problem with thinking of retroviruses as disease agents. Traditionally, when a germ causes a disease, you see high titers, you see lots and lots of germs attacking cells. But with retroviruses, you don't really get that. That's why the science is lacking. So, to get this retroviral theory of disease, you have to invent all sorts of bizarre ideas and pictures. You have to do it with cows and sheep and pigs and humans. You are forced to imagine that a germ is really like TNT and two or three of them go off and the body collapses. That may be interesting to entertain, but it isn't science.

JR: SOME RESEARCHERS HAVE TRIED TO PROVE THAT HIV CAUSES AIDS BY ANALOGY. THEY SAY THAT OTHER RETROVIRUSES CAUSE SLOW WASTING DISEASE IN SHEEP OR CANCER IN COWS, SO HIV COULD CAUSE AIDS.

PD: Yes. But that cow and sheep research is suffering from the same problem as HIV. It's unproven. With sheep, you're dealing with genetic problems, and with bovine leukemia there is no proof that a retrovirus is the cause. People think that because animals or humans are dying, that alone is sufficient evidence that the favorite virus of the moment is the real culprit. You have to take that logic apart. When you do, it just turns to dust in your hands.

JR: DO YOU THINK YOU WILL REGAIN YOUR FORMER STATUS IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY?

PD: I've had offers to go back to Germany and do research and teach. Good offers.

JR: WHY DON'T YOU?

PD: I like America. I've lived here for a long time.

JR: SOME RESEARCHERS ARE NOW COMING FORWARD AND SAYING THAT HIV DOES NOT EVEN EXIST. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS?

PD: There are two points here. Yes, it is very difficult to isolate HIV--which suggests that it is present in the body in extremely small amounts, and therefore it is a non-candidate for the cause of any disease. In Gallo's lab, they had to do all sorts of things to get HIV to grow in a dish. So is HIV just some debris that has been misidentified from the beginning? I would say no. The virus exists, you can transmit it from person to person, but you can do that with millions of other

germs which, like HIV, cause nothing. Of course, the HIV blood test will read positive for a variety of reasons which have nothing to do with the presence of HIV.

JR: CAN YOU SEE YOURSELF JUST DROPPING THE WHOLE HIV ISSUE AND GOING ON TO OTHER THINGS, AND NEVER LOOKING BACK?

PD: (laughs) It's a thought. But no, whatever else I do, HIV and AIDS will be there. Other people and I have gone too far, we've opened the Pandora's box. If as a scientist you just force yourself to forget a truth, a significant truth, things become muddy. You become a little estranged from the reason you chose your work and your profession in the first place.

JR: IT'S UNUSUAL THAT A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF YOUR FAME HAVING TO DO WITH AIDS CAME FROM INTERVIEWS YOU DID IN THE NEW YORK NATIVE, A SMALL GAY NEWSPAPER IN NEW YORK. SCIENTISTS DON'T GO TO A VENUE LIKE THAT TO BE HEARD.

PD: They deserve a lot of credit. Chuck Ortleb, the publisher, and John Lauritsen, the reporter who interviewed me.

JR: ORTLEB STARTED THAT PAPER WITH \$500.

PD: Lauritsen is a very tenacious journalist. He's very smart.

JR: IN A BETTER WORLD, HE WOULD HAVE WON A COUPLE OF PULITZERS.

PD: I certainly think so. I had no problem with going outside the mainstream science journals. I wanted the other side to be heard, and they were willing. Eventually, their stories forced other reporters to consider the issues we were raising.

JR: SO IS AIDS ONE THING, ONE DISEASE, ONE CONDITION?

PD: There is no reason to think so. If you look at the various so-called high-risk groups around the world, you find different causes for the immune suppression called AIDS.

JR: BUT CALLING ALL THIS AIDS CERTAINLY CREATES A PHARMACEUTICAL BONANZA.

PD: I know you've pointed this out in the writing you've done. Yes, if you can claim a single germ is at the root, you can start selling drugs. If you can't do that, if you have to admit that certain chemicals, starvation, poverty are causatively involved in different groups, then the pharmaceutical solutions become impossible to justify.

JR: THE SAME SITUATION COULD BE SAID TO APPLY, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE AREA OF SO-CALLED MENTAL ILLNESSES. IF YOU CAN USE DISEASE NAMES, YOU CAN SELL LOTS OF DRUGS.

PD: What has been exposed about AIDS...it suggests that might not be the only area of fraud. But I think I would have to examine things on a case by case basis. One disease at a time.

JR: BECOMING INVOLVED WITH THE HIV SCANDAL...THIS IS AN ENORMOUS THING.

PD: It is enormous because people are dying when they could be saved, and because there is so much false science involved.

JR: HAS THE FALSE SCIENCE SURPRISED YOU?

PD: Yes and no. I woke up to a world that I suppose I sensed was there. But you don't like to think about it. Once I woke up, I had no choice.

JR: ARE YOU DISILLUSIONED?

PD: Somewhat. But in a stronger way, I'm alert. Aware.

JR: IT CAN'T BE A HAPPY EVENT TO SEE YOUR LAB DECIMATED AND THE NUMBER OF CLASSES YOU TEACH DRASTICALLY REDUCED AT BERKELEY.

PD: When you find that knowledge works against you, it isn't exactly fun if you're a scientist.

JR: ON THE OTHER HAND, IT CAN'T BE ALL BAD IF YOU HAVE THE CHANCE TO SHOW THAT YOUR FORMER COLLEAGUES IN THE WAR ON CANCER, THE ONES WHO LATER FORGED AHEAD WITH FALSE SCIENCE ON AIDS, ARE QUITE WRONG AND MISGUIDED.

PD: Well, that motivation is a dim bulb next to the reality that we have to spread the truth.

JR: CAN YOU IMAGINE WAKING UP ONE DAY TO FIND THAT HIV REALLY DOES CAUSE AIDS?

PD: No. But I've always said, show me the evidence and I'll live with that. The evidence just isn't there, and now this virus is the most studied germ in human history. They've taken it to Mongolia and back and turned it inside out. It turns out that HIV is not very mysterious at all. It's quite like a lot of other retroviruses--small, fairly simple, and lazy. It lies around and shows no real signs of biological activity in the body. The great mystery they attach to it--it's really just that they can't figure out how it causes all that devastation to the immune system. That's the mystery. And all they have to do is admit that it DOESN'T cause illness. And then the strangeness and the myth will be gone.

JR: SO HIV IS NOT INCREDIBLY COMPLEX.

PD: Of course not. They have to weave their legend. And with every year, the legend is added to, the stories grow, the religion is built. If they have to, they'll say there are 78 different HIVs, they'll fly a rocket to Venus and bring another strain of HIV back. They'll say it comes from monkeys or ducks or butterflies.

JR: AZT REALLY ISN'T AN ANTIVIRAL DRUG, IS IT?

PD: It's a general cell-destroyer, like any chemotherapy drug. If you give a person enough of it, and if the person isn't lucky enough, metabolically, to keep urinating it out, AZT will reduce everything in the body. It is a poison. There's nothing "surgical" or sophisticated about it. When they gave it to Nureyev, it turned his legs, those legs of a great dancer, to jelly.

JR: A DRUG FOR A VIRUS, A DRUG THAT DOESN'T SPECIFICALLY ATTACK THE VIRUS.

PD: A virus that doesn't cause anything. The drug is a terrible poison. It isn't complicated. You see, they want to make a case for a very complex situation...you have this virus that no one understands, which is somehow, in a way no one can figure out, attacking the immune system. And the drug magically reduces the viral population. But that isn't it. That isn't it at all. I'm telling you, this is a pseudo-religion. It's backed by billions of research dollars.

JR: THIS IS A CASE OF MEDICAL MURDER.

PD: I'm afraid it is.

JR: AND NOW THEY WANT TO GIVE AZT TO PREGNANT MOTHERS WHO TEST POSITIVE FOR HIV.

PD: Oh, they are giving it to pregnant mothers. The numbers of these expectant mothers on AZT are growing. It's the height of insanity. And they're giving it to babies too. Or you take a child who was living in an orphanage and who was starving...and the child tests positive for HIV--which means nothing--and they immediately start this child on AZT.

JR: ARE THE OTHER DRUGS THAT ARE WITH AZT PART OF THE "AIDS COCKTAIL" ANY DIFFERENT FROM AZT?

PD: These main drugs act in the same way.

JR: WHAT ABOUT SO-CALLED VIRAL LOAD?

PD: Ah yes, the coming thing. This is another delusion used to foster the idea that HIV really does accumulate in large quantities in various sites of the body. It is more false science based on misnomers and bad math.



JR: GOING BACK TO THE IDEA OF ANTIBODIES TO HIV AGAIN...MANY PEOPLE ARE ASTONISHED TO LEARN THAT IN ONE CASE--RECEIVING THE VACCINE--THE ANTIBODIES ARE SAID TO PROTECT AGAINST AIDS, BUT WHEN THE AIDS BLOOD TEST REVEALS THE PRESENCE OF THESE SAME ANTIBODIES, THIS IS SAID TO PREDICT FUTURE DECIMATION FROM AIDS.

PD: I can tell you that the astonishment of the public when they see this is no greater than the astonishment of scientists when they realize the same thing. When I say shoddy science, I don't just mean sophisticated manipulation of technical esoterica...I mean just plain crazy stuff.

JR: MANY HEALTH PRACTITIONERS WHO USE ALTERNATIVE METHODS SAY THEY ARE HEALING AIDS.

PD: Most of these people still assume HIV causes AIDS, and they base their assertions of cures on "making HIV vanish" or something like that. In which case, I have no idea what they are doing. If they're simply saying they're curing various infections...that's a whole different proposition.

JR: SOME SCIENTISTS SEEM TO SPEND ALL THEIR TIME DECIPHERING THE GENETIC SEQUENCE OF HIV.

PD: HIV has a rather clear genetic makeup. Nothing strange here. HIV turns out to look like lots of other harmless retroviruses. So what? They keep hoping to find a weird unprecedented feature which would explain the assumed virulence of the germ. It's more science fiction.

JR: WHAT ABOUT ALL THOSE "PHOTOS" OF HIV DESTROYING CELLS WHICH IT INHABITS?

PD: Computerized estimates. It's like a graphic made to look very real.

JR: MICKEY MOUSE.

PD: But less interesting.

JR: YOUR BREAKTHROUGH IN THE CASE OF AIDS HAS BEEN A NEGATIVE TRUTH.

PD: It looks like more and more science is going to take that shape. Undoing the incorrect assertions of other scientists who are obsessed with success.

JR: DO YOU THINK A HUNDRED YEARS FROM NOW PEOPLE WILL LOOK BACK ON AIDS AND SEE IT AS A MONSTROUS WRONG TURN?

PD: They will see the research in that light.

JR: DOES AIDS RESEARCH MAKE YOU THINK THAT WE ARE LIVING IN THE MIDDLE OF SOME CULTURAL MADNESS?

PD: It's the money and the profits and the prestige and the prizes. These things have taken over. Science was supposed to be immune from that, but it isn't.

JR: PEOPLE SAY THOUSANDS OF SCIENTISTS COULDN'T ALL BE WRONG ABOUT HIV.

PD: They couldn't all be wrong if they were doing real science. But that isn't the case. These thousands of scientists have done nothing to assure themselves that HIV causes AIDS. You have to understand that. They haven't done any basic research. They've presumed that the basic research was done. It wasn't. There were some patients with low T-cell counts. A few scientists took blood from those patients and said they found a new germ, and that germ must be the cause of their disease-conditions. But that thinking has holes in it the size of Maryland.

JR: THOSE PATIENTS MIGHT HAVE BEEN SUFFERING FROM DIFFERENT TYPES OF T-CELL DEPLETION. DEPLETION FROM DIFFERENT CAUSES.

PD: Yes. And to find that new germ, you have to direct the lens of your investigation to a certain area. HIV didn't just pop up. In these few patients, you could perhaps have found a hundred germs you had never seen before if you looked at blood with electron microscopes. Those few patients might have had all 100 of the germs in their bodies--germs no one had ever seen. Germs that do nothing but lie around. To find a germ you've never seen doesn't mean you've found a germ that causes disease.

JR: SO HIV IS NOT NECESSARILY A GERM THAT EVOLVED IN ANIMALS AND SUDDENLY JUMPED INTO HUMANS FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 1980.

PD: With new equipment, more powerful microscopes, in 1980 you could find a germ you'd never seen that had been in humans for 100,000 years.

###END INTERVIEW###

## **AIDS INC: Select Notes on PART ONE: THE UNPROVEN AIDS EPIDEMIC**

### **Chapter 5: Who Pop the Poppers**

“...consider a drug called poppers. A street-drug. Could poppers be responsible for some cases of what is being called AIDS? All by itself? The second most significant symptom of AIDS has been kaposi sarcoma. Could poppers be responsible for many of those kaposi cases?”

Kaposi Sarcoma has been listed as the number two major symptom, the number two defining-disease, of AIDS.

CONCLUSION: If HIV is set aside as the cause of AIDS, then we see that poppers alone could cause SOME cases of what is being called AIDS. Yet the federal government has taken no real action to make this link. This is surely a crime.

### **Chapter 7: Years of Antibiotics: More on Chemical AIDS**

CONCLUSION: Overuse of antibiotics alone can suppress the immune system, and can result in all the signs of what is being called HIV-caused AIDS.

### **Chapter 9: Enter AZT**

USE AZT TO TREAT AIDS, A CONDITION WHOSE HALLMARK IS IMMUNE-SUPPRESSION. USE IMMUNE-SUPPRESSION TO TREAT IMMUNE- SUPPRESSION.

CONCLUSION: AIDS HAS BECOME A SELF- FULFILLING PROPHECY. FOR ITS SUPPOSED SYMPTOMS, GIVE A DRUG WHICH KILLS CELLS, WHICH ATTACKS THE IMMUNE SYSTEM. WE NOW HAVE MEDICALLY INDUCED AZT AIDS.

NOTE: In the largest tracking study in the history of AIDS-the San Francisco Men's Study--a significant group emerged. Men who while healthy had been diagnosed as HIV-positive, who had not taken AZT, who had remained healthy for at least ten years! The Study researchers had chosen not to trumpet this fact, even though it indicated that being positive for HIV was not necessarily a sign of impending illness. Even though it indicated that AZT was a terribly toxic inducer of illness.

### **Chapter 10: Malnutrition AIDS**

“...the ‘disease’ is hunger, not AIDS.”

CONCLUSION: WE NOW HAVE POPPER AIDS, PESTICIDE AIDS, MALNUTRITION AIDS AND AZT AIDS.

### **Chapter 11: A case study in confusion: AIDS in Uganda**

CONCLUSION: AIDS IN THIRD-WORLD COUNTRIES CAN BE EASILY SEEN AS A WHOLE GROUP OF IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE FACTORS, NONE OF WHICH HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH HIV.

**AIDS INC: Select Notes on PART THREE: HIDDEN IMMUNOSUPPRESSION**

**Chapter 26: Biowarfare Research**

CONCLUSION: CERTAINLY PART OF THE IMMUNOSUPPRESSION CALLED AIDS HAS SPRUNG FROM BIOWARFARE LABS. SO WE HAVE PESTICIDE AIDS AND MALNUTRITION AIDS AND AZT AIDS AND CONTAMINATED- WATER AIDS AND STREET-DRUG AIDS AND MEDICAL LAB AIDS AND BIOWARFARE/CHEMICAL WARFARE AIDS.

**Chapter 31: The Power of Suggestion and the AIDS Blood Test**

CONCLUSION: THE HIV VIRUS HAS NEVER BEEN PROVED TO CAUSE DISEASE. NEVERTHELESS, A TEST IS DEVELOPED TO DETECT WHETHER THE BODY HAS ENCOUNTERED THIS VIRUS OR NOT. THIS TEST IS FULL OF HOLES, AND PRODUCES MANY FALSELY POSITIVE READINGS. SINCE HIV IS SAID TO BE INVARIABLY FATAL, THE TEST ACTS AS A PIECE OF HYPNOTIC TERRORISM. WHAT IS CLAIMED TO BE A POSITIVE READING INDUCES TREMENDOUS FEAR—WHICH IN ITSELF IS HIGHLY IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE. MORE THAN THAT, A POSITIVE TEST IS A GATEWAY INTO TAKING AZT, PERHAPS THE MOST TOXIC DRUG EVER RELEASED FOR LONG-TERM HUMAN USE—A DRUG WHICH CAUSES SEVERE IMMUNOSUPPRESSION AND DEATH.

**AIDS INC: Select Notes on APPENDICES**

**Appendix 3: REVISION OF THE CDC SURVEILLANCE CASE DEFINITION FOR ACQUIRED IMMUNODEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) (1987)**

Appendix 3 is a re-print of the entire Centers For Disease Control (CDC) 1987 AIDS definition.

I have reprinted it in its entirety because many physicians have apparently not seen it, and because it is enlightening to realize how many diseases, infections, and therefore symptoms are being attributed to the underlying action of HIV.

It is clear from reading this Kafka-like definition that almost anything can now be called AIDS. It is also clear that this definition has automatically caused the numbers of AIDS cases reported to swell. That increase guarantees more research monies. It also paves the way for "medical success" in treating AIDS—because at a later date, perhaps after the introduction of an AIDS vaccine, a new definition of AIDS will be put forward. It will be a narrower definition, which will automatically cause the numbers of AIDS cases to shrink, and medical authorities will claim

that the vaccine actually made the numbers of AIDS cases decline. Another criminal strategy at work.

Note-1: In Appendix 3, there is a sub-section call COMMENTARY. That section is part of the definition and not the commentary of Jon Rappoport.

Note-2: In this reprint of the CDC's definition found in Appendix 3 of *AIDS INC.*, there is mention of Appendices I through IV. These Appendices (I through IV) are Appendices to the CDC's definition and are not references to see other Appendices in the *AIDS INC.* book. As such, these Appendices to the CDC's definition are contained entirely within Appendix 3 of *AIDS INC.* and are entirely found at the end of Appendix 3 to *AIDS INC.*

**AIDS INC: A VERY BRIEF EPILOG WRITTEN IN 2003**

Now that you've read all this material, you realize how gigantic a hoax AIDS is. You should also realize how dangerous the medical cartel is. It works from behind a wall of seeming impartiality, as if it is merely reporting facts and making discoveries by using the latest technology. Of course, this is not true, but it makes a great cover. The research process appears to be the exact opposite of pronouncement by superstition, and therefore many smart children grow up wanting to be part of this cartel.

"If it looks like technology, it must be technology, and therefore it must be true." On this rock a whole civilization is in peril.

JON RAPPOPORT